

[3rd September 1928]

*Amendment of the Estates Land Act.*

\* 19 Q.—The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have taken into consideration my representation regarding the setting off of the arrears of rent if a landholder bids under section 130 of the Madras Estates Land Act; and

(b) whether the Government propose to include a provision like this in their intended amending Bill?

A.—(a) & (b) The draft Bill now under the consideration of the Government contains a provision to this effect.

**Revenue Establishments**

*Alleged assault of a ryot of Katpadi by the Tahsildar of Gudiyattam.*

\* 20 Q.—MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Tahsildar of Gudiyattam, one Mr. Gnanaprakasam, recently assaulted a ryot of Katpadi when he was camping in that village;

(b) whether there was a criminal complaint about him in the local panchayat court; and

(c) whether Government are aware that the same officer, on a previous occasion, kicked a Hindu idol; and

(d) whether the Government propose to instruct the Collector concerned to transfer him to some other taluk?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have not heard of any such case.

(c) No.

(d) Having regard to the answer to the questions (a), (b) and (c) the answer to this clause is in the negative.

MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—“Did Government make any enquiries or did they call for a report?”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—“No, Sir.”

MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—“Will they be pleased to call for a report?”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—“No, Sir, unless the hon. Member can give me some indication of the likelihood of such allegation being true.”

MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—“The information was in the newspaper. I think the kicking of the idol was before this House.”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—“I will look that matter up, Sir.”

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“As regards the kicking of the idol that was a matter which came up before this Council. I think the Government would at least make enquiries in the matter.”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—“I wish to be assured, Sir, that the hon. Member verified the allegations.”

3rd September 1928]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" When an hon. Member puts a question he generally makes his best endeavours to satisfy himself ; that has repeatedly been the subject of discussion on the floor of this House."

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Before making an enquiry whether an officer of the Government committed a criminal offence I must satisfy myself whether the Member has grounds for the allegation."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" When a question has been put in the form in which it is put, I wish to know whether any further assurance from the hon. Member is necessary."

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I think so."

Mr. P. BHAKTAVATSULU NAYUDU :—" Will the hon. the Revenue Member be pleased to say whether after the receipt of the question Government moved in the matter to find out or verify the truth or the facts of the allegation?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I have answered that question."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" This is a matter of some importance, Sir ; I do not know whether you would like to raise it now or after question time."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think that it would be better to raise it after question time."

### Settlement

#### *Supply of the scheme report for the resettlement of the Godavari and Kistna districts.*

\* 21 Q.—Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state— 11-45 a.m.

(a) whether it is a fact that the scheme report for the resettlement of the Godavari East and West and the Kistna districts was supplied only to the subscribers to the three district gazettes and not to every village along with the village sheet of the district gazettes ;

(b) what is the number of subscribers to each of the district gazettes of East Godavari, West Godavari and Kistna ; and how many of the subscribers in each case are private gentlemen and how many are servants of either the Government or of the local bodies ;

(c) whether any cultivating ryots are subscribing to any of these district gazettes, and if so, how many such ryots there are ; and

(d) whether the Government propose to publish the scheme report in question along with the village sheet of the three district gazettes and to distribute it to every village so as to place it within easy reach of the ryot population ?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The scheme report was published in the district gazettes in December 1927. The Government do not know how many subscribers there are to the district gazettes or who they are. In February 1928, the report was placed at the disposal of the Press. A notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of 21st February stated that copies were then available